

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7-12 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 6,636,749 (Holmes) in view of US 5,991,640 (Lilja).

The office action on page 4 states “the remote communication device translating between the WPAN communications link and the cellular link (item 127 in Figure 6; Col. 6, lines 57-65).”

The applicant believes that the office action mischaracterizes the cited reference. The office action appears to be equating “Bluetooth device 127” of the reference with “the remote communication device” of claim 1. Although the Bluetooth device 127 may be a wireless phone, Holmes does not show or suggest the Bluetooth device 127 “translating between the WPAN communications link and the cellular link” as recited in independent claims 1 and 10.

Based on the applicant’s conclusion that “Bluetooth device 127” does not use a “cellular link”, the applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable.

Furthermore, claims 1 and 10 recite “if the handset is in the undocked condition, the handset routing the audio component through the handset.” The office action on page 4 states “item 106 in Figure 5; Col. 8 lines 59-65; also the handset is able to communicate through the remote communication device 127).” The applicant asserts that Bluetooth module 106 gets audio component from wireless device 10 via the audio connector 302 and routes the audio component to the Bluetooth device 126. Thus, Holmes does not teach or suggest routing of audio component through the handset when the handset is in the undocked condition. See Holmes, Figure 5.

Thus, Holmes teaches away from “the undocked condition.” Accordingly, the applicant believes that claims 1 and 10 are patentable.

Claims 5, 6, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Holmes in view of Lilja and further in view of US2003/0008680 (Huh).

As discussed above, since Holmes is an inappropriate basis for rejecting Applicants’ claims, Holmes in combination with any other reference is also an inappropriate basis for rejecting Applicants’ claims.

The application is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By: /Indira Saladi/
Indira Saladi
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,759

Telephone: 847-538-7588
Fax No.: 847-576-0721